

REMARKS

A petition to extend the time for response by two (2) months is enclosed herewith.

A new independent claim 32 and new dependent claims 33 - 35 depending ultimately therefrom have been added. Claims 16 - 35 are currently pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 16-19, 23, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030. Also, in the Office Action, claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764. Furthermore, in the Office Action, claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Park et al US Patent Application No. 2005/0252028. Moreover, in the Office Action, claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783. Also, in the Office Action, claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030.

With respect to the allowability of claim 24 of the present application, it is noted that the "Office Action Summary" of the Office Action indicates, under "Disposition of Claims", that claims 16 – 31 is/are rejected. However, it is pointed out the Office Action does not set forth the ground(s) of rejection of claim 24.

With respect to the prior art rejections of claims 16 – 23 and 25 - 31, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

The present invention is directed to an inventive method for drying laundry in a dryer and an inventive laundry dryer. The inventive method, which may be performed in the inventive laundry dryer, advantageously performs an anti-creasing cycle that minimizes the formation of undesirable creases in the laundry

being dried. Attention is directed to claim 16 of the present application, which recites a method for drying laundry in a dryer comprising a housing and a drum receiving the laundry and mounted for rotation with respect to the housing. The inventive method includes, as recited in claim 16, performing a drying program including a heating-up phase, a drying phase, and a cooling-down phase and performing an anti-crease cycle. The anti-crease cycle has alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest. Furthermore, the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter.

Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 discloses a clothes dryer 10 including a drum 11 having a bulkhead 12 in which there is an inlet aperture 13 and a drive motor 17 to drive a fan and connected in a driving relationship with the drum 11. The clothes dryer 10 also includes a digital control circuit 23, a digital counter circuit 26, a memory 28 and a control logic circuit 27. The control logic circuit 27 includes a plurality of outputs for controlling various machine functions and, accordingly, for controlling the program of the dryer. Janke '030 discloses a method of controlling a fabric treating apparatus comprising the steps of (a) initiating a fabric treating operation; (b) sensing a parameter related to the condition of the fabric within the treatment zone; (c) counting pulses from a source of timing signals; (d) repeatedly terminating and restarting the count until said sensed parameter reaches a predetermined value; and (e) terminating the fabric treating operation upon the accumulation of a preselected count.

Claims 16 – 23 and 25 - 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 or are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 in view of one of several secondary references. It is respectfully submitted that these rejections

cannot be sustained in view of the failure of Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 to teach or disclose the present invention, as will be discussed now in more detail.

The Office Action asserts that Janke '030 discloses performing an anti-crease cycle that has alternating intervals including rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, with the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter and the Office Action refers to Column 5, lines 18 – 48, of Janke '030 as allegedly providing this disclosure. However, it is submitted that Janke '030 does not even hint at the desirability of a laundry drying cycle in which rotary movement time intervals, in which the drum is rotated to agitate the laundry, and stoppage time intervals, in which the drum stops rotating and the laundry is at rest, are controlled in relation to one another, let alone controlled in relation to one another in response to an operating parameter, to say nothing of any hint in Janke '030 of the desirability of an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter, as is recited in, for example, claim 16 of the present application. Instead, Janke '030 discloses, in, for instance, the identified portion of Column 5, lines 18 – 48, that a fabric treating operation includes repeatedly terminating and restarting a count until a sensed parameter reaches a predetermined value and terminating the fabric treating operation upon the accumulation of a preselected count. There is simply no mention in Janke '030 of an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter.

The Office Action additionally asserts that Janke '030 also discloses the claimed operating parameter of the length of time of the anti-crease cycle as shown in Figure 3 of Janke '030. However, it is pointed out that the truth table of Figure 3 of Janke '030 merely appears to disclose a drying cycle with stoppage

time intervals (e.g., "Pause – 5 minutes") and rotary movement intervals (e.g., "Tumble – 5 sec."). The truth table does not give any hint or indication of the desirability of decreasing a duration of the rotary movement intervals in relation to a stoppage time interval in response to an operating parameter and it is in no way apparent that the values of the stoppage time intervals and rotary movement intervals in the truth table were determined or calculated in relationship to one another, let alone were determined or calculated such that a duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to a stoppage time interval in response to an operating parameter.

In view of the failure of Janke US Patent No. 3,702,030 to teach or disclose the present invention, the rejection of claims 16 – 23 and 25 - 31 must necessarily be supported by some disclosure in the secondary references that could remedy the deficiencies of Janke '030. In this regard, it is submitted that Park et al US Patent Application No. 2005/0252028 is not available as prior art against the present application. With regard to St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764, the Office Action asserts that this reference discloses a pre-selected drying program selected by the user. While St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 may disclose such a pre-selected drying program selected by the user, it is not seen and the Office Action has not alleged that St. Louis US Patent Application 2003/0097764 teaches or discloses an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter.

With regard to Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783, this reference is alleged to disclose a drum reversing feature for a clothes dryer. While that may be so, it is not seen and the Office Action has not alleged that Worst US Patent No. 3,309,783 teaches or discloses an anti-crease cycle in which the duration of the rotary movement intervals decreases in relation to the stoppage time intervals in response to an operating parameter. Accordingly, it is urged that the prior art

rejections of claims 16 – 23 and 25 – 31 be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

New independent claim 32 and new dependent claims 33 - 35 depending ultimately therefrom are also submitted to patentably define over the prior art of record and favorable consideration of these new claims is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 16 - 35 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted



James E. Howard

Registration No. 39,715

April 16, 2009

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-639-7644
Fax: 714-845-2807
james.howard@bshg.com